UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,909	12/17/2003	Theodoros Salonidis	58501.00046	4027

32294   7590   07/03/2007

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14TH FLOOR
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER
KAO, JUTAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/736,909	SALONIDIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ju-Tai Kao	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-8* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*17 December 2003*</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>*12/17/2003*</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 7 claims a computer program embodied

on computer-readable media without stating that the computer programs are executed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 3, where "a first new bandwidth allocation" is recited while the

parent claim (claim 1) also recited "a first new bandwidth allocation". For the purpose of

this office action, the examiner interprets these two "new bandwidth allocation" as the

same bandwidth allocation as opposed to two separate new allocations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6.   Claim 1-2, and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kondylis (US 6,621,805) in view of Cousins (US 6,618,385) and Galand (US

6,628,670).

Kondylis discloses a method and apparatus for adaptive bandwidth reservation in

wireless ad-hoc networks including the following features.

Regarding claim 1, a method of allocating bandwidth (see "reserve bandwidth"

recited in column 6, line 17) in a first node (see "a set of transmitters...reserve

bandwidth" recited in column 6, line 16-17) that is operable in an ad hoc wireless

network (see "wireless ad-hoc network" in the title) configured to support at least one

guaranteed feasible flow allocation (see "adapt the reserved bandwidth according to

traffic fluctuation" recited in column 6, line 17-19; that is, guaranteed feasible because it

dynamically adapts").

Regarding claim 4, initiating a communication between the first node and the

second node (explained below in the rejection of claim 1 using Cousins) in a slotted

(see "ad-hoc nodes...timeslot reservation" recited in column 6, line 24-25), ad hoc,

wireless network (see "wireless ad-hoc network" in the title).

Regarding claim 6, a network device (see "a set of transmitters...reserve

bandwidth" recited in column 6, line 16-17) of allocating bandwidth (see "reserve

bandwidth" recited in column 6, line 17) in a first node (see "a set of

transmitters...reserve bandwidth" recited in column 6, line 16-17) that is operable in an

ad hoc wireless network (see "wireless ad-hoc network" in the title) configured to

support at least one guaranteed feasible flow allocation (see "adapt the reserved

bandwidth according to traffic fluctuation" recited in column 6, line 17-19; that is,

guaranteed feasible because it dynamically adapts").

Regarding claim 7, a computer program embodied on computer-readable media

(see "computer product" recited in the abstract), with the computer program configured

to allocate bandwidth (see "reserve bandwidth" recited in column 6, line 17) in a first

node (see "a set of transmitters...reserve bandwidth" recited in column 6, line 16-17)

that is operable in an ad hoc wireless network (see "wireless ad-hoc network" in the

title) configured to support at least one guaranteed feasible flow allocation (see "adapt

the reserved bandwidth according to traffic fluctuation" recited in column 6, line 17-19;

that is, guaranteed feasible because it dynamically adapts").

Regarding claim 8, a network device (see "a set of transmitters...reserve

bandwidth" recited in column 6, line 16-17) of allocating bandwidth (see "reserve

bandwidth" recited in column 6, line 17) in a first node (see "a set of

transmitters...reserve bandwidth" recited in column 6, line 16-17) that is operable in an

ad hoc wireless network (see "wireless ad-hoc network" in the title) configured to

support at least one guaranteed feasible flow allocation (see "adapt the reserved

bandwidth according to traffic fluctuation" recited in column 6, line 17-19; that is,

guaranteed feasible because it dynamically adapts").

Kondylis does not disclose the following features: regarding claim 1, the method

comprising the steps of: initiating a communication between the first node and a second

node in the network that, together, are endpoints of a link, the communication being

related to possible bandwidth allocation adjustment of a flow sharing the link;

determining, in the first node, a first new bandwidth allocation that approaches a first

optimization condition for the flow; communicating with the second node to determine a

mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation for the flow; notifying neighbor

nodes in the network of the mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation when

reallocation is needed; and adopting the mutually-agreed upon optimal allocation for the

flow when the reallocation is needed; regarding claim 2, re-performing the initiating,

determining, communicating, notifying, and adopting steps at a later point in time;

regarding claim 5, initiating a communication between the first node and the second

node in a network on which a Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) schedule is

implemented; regarding claim 6, a first communication unit configured to initiate a

communication between the device and a node in the network that, together, are

endpoints of a link in the network, the communication being related to possible

bandwidth allocation adjustment of a flow sharing the link; a first processing unit

configured to determine a first new bandwidth allocation that approaches a first

optimization condition for the flow, wherein the first processing unit is operably

connected to the first communication unit; a second communication unit configured to

communicate with the node to determine a mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth

allocation for the flow, wherein the second communication unit is operably connected to

the first communication unit; a third communication unit configured to notify neighbor

nodes in the network of the mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation when

reallocation is needed, wherein the third communication unit is operably connected to

the first communication unit; and a second processing unit configured to adopt the

mutually-agreed upon optimal allocation for the flow when reallocation is needed,

wherein the second processing unit is operably connected to the first communication

unit; regarding claim 7, the computer program comprising: a first sub-routine for

initiating a communication between the first node and a second node in the network

that, together, are endpoints of a link, the communication being related to possible

bandwidth allocation adjustment of a flow sharing the link; a second sub-routine for

determining, in the first node, a first new bandwidth allocation that approaches a first

optimization condition for the flow; a third sub-routine for communicating with the

second node to determine a mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation for the

flow; a fourth sub-routine for notifying neighbor nodes in the network of the mutually-

agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation when reallocation is needed; and a fifth sub-

routine for adopting the mutually-agreed upon optimal allocation for the flow when the

reallocation is needed; regarding claim 8, initiation means for initiating a communication

between the first node and a second node in the network that, together, are endpoints

of a link, the communication being related to possible bandwidth allocation adjustment

of a flow sharing the link; determination means for determining, in the first node, a first

new bandwidth allocation that approaches a first optimization condition for the flow;

communication means for communicating with the second node to determine a

mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation for the flow; notification means for

notifying neighbor nodes in the network of the mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth

allocation when reallocation is needed; and adoption means for adopting the mutually-

agreed upon optimal allocation for the flow when the reallocation is needed

Cousins discloses a high performance, high bandwidth, and adaptive local area

network communications including the following features.

Regarding claim 1, initiating a communication between (see "two

machines...communicate..." recited in column 7, line 40-41) the first node (see "DTE

(sender)" recited in column 5, line 8) and a second node ("DCE (receiver)" recited in

column 5, line 8-9) in the network (see "two machines in the LAN" recited in column 7,

line 40-41) that, together, are endpoints of a link (DTE being the sender end and DCE

being the receiver end), the communication being related to possible bandwidth

allocation adjustment of a flow sharing the link (see "negotiation session ...to determine the best use of the available bandwidth" recited in column 7, line 44-47); determining, in the first node (see "designated DTE...determine the parameters..." recited in column 7, line 15-16) , a first new bandwidth allocation (see "determine...optimized bandwidth, and optimized transfer conditions" recited in column 3, line 44-46) that approaches a first optimization condition for the flow (see "bandwidth...optimized given the condition and quality of the line connection" recited in column 3, line 57-58); communicating with the second node (see "DTE communicates with...DCE regarding the various measurements...to determine the parameters..." recited in column 7, line 11-16) to determine a mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation for the flow (see "determine the best use of the available bandwidth..." recited in column 7, line 46-47; also "negotiation further includes reservation of...bandwidth" recited in column 7, line 49-50); and adopting the mutually-agreed upon optimal allocation for the flow when the reallocation is needed (see "These parameters are then utilized..." recited in column 3, line 52-53).

Regarding claim 2, re-performing the initiating, determining, communicating, notifying, and adopting steps at a later point in time (see "network initialization process may continue...ongoing calibration...may also be performed whenever there is a changed condition..." recited in column 6, line 19-26; wherein the initialization process includes all processes described above in the rejection made to claim 1, and the notifying step is disclosed in Galand below, where the notifying step could be incorporated into the initialization process described here).

Regarding claim 5, initiating a communication between the first node and the

second node in a network (explained above in the rejection made to claim 1) on which a

Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) schedule is implemented (see "TDMA" recited in

column 10, line 45-50).

Regarding claim 6, a first communication unit (see "interface adapter 200 of the

designated DTE" recited in column 7, line 11) configured to initiate a communication

between (see "two machines...communicate..." recited in column 7, line 40-41) the

device (see "DTE (sender)" recited in column 5, line 8) and a node ("DCE (receiver)"

recited in column 5, line 8-9) in the network (see "two machines in the LAN" recited in

column 7, line 40-41) that, together, are endpoints of a link in the network (DTE being

the sender end and DCE being the receiver end), the communication being related to

possible bandwidth allocation adjustment of a flow sharing the link (see "negotiation

session ...to determine the best use of the available bandwidth" recited in column 7, line

44-47; a first processing unit (again, the DTE described above) configured to determine

a first new bandwidth allocation (see "determine...optimized bandwidth, and optimized

transfer conditions" recited in column 3, line 44-46) that approaches a first optimization

condition for the flow (see "bandwidth...optimized given the condition and quality of the

line connection" recited in column 3, line 57-58), wherein the first processing unit is

operably connected to the first communication unit (the DTE is connected to the DTE

adapter; see Fig. 2 "TO/FROM DTE" connection with the adapter 200); a second

communication unit configured (the DTE itself) to communicate with the node (see "DTE

communicates with...DCE regarding the various measurements...to determine the

parameters..." recited in column 7, line 11-16) to determine a mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation for the flow (see "determine the best use of the available bandwidth..." recited in column 7, line 46-47; also "negotiation further includes reservation of...bandwidth" recited in column 7, line 49-50), wherein the second communication unit is operably connected to the first communication unit (the DTE includes both units); and a second processing unit (the DTE itself) configured to adopt the mutually-agreed upon optimal allocation for the flow when the reallocation is needed (see "These parameters are then utilized..." recited in column 3, line 52-53), wherein the second processing unit is operably connected to the first communication unit (the DTE includes both units).

Regarding claim 7, a first sub-routine for initiating a communication between (see "two machines...communicate..." recited in column 7, line 40-41) the first node (see "DTE (sender)" recited in column 5, line 8) and a second node ("DCE (receiver)" recited in column 5, line 8-9) in the network (see "two machines in the LAN" recited in column 7, line 40-41) that, together, are endpoints of a link (DTE being the sender end and DCE being the receiver end), the communication being related to possible bandwidth allocation adjustment of a flow sharing the link (see "negotiation session ...to determine the best use of the available bandwidth" recited in column 7, line 44-47); a second sub-routine for determining, in the first node (see "designated DTE...determine the parameters..." recited in column 7, line 15-16) , a first new bandwidth allocation (see "determine...optimized bandwidth, and optimized transfer conditions" recited in column 3, line 44-46) that approaches a first optimization condition for the flow (see

"bandwidth...optimized given the condition and quality of the line connection" recited in column 3, line 57-58); a third sub-routine for communicating with the second node (see "DTE communicates with...DCE regarding the various measurements...to determine the parameters..." recited in column 7, line 11-16) to determine a mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation for the flow (see "determine the best use of the available bandwidth..." recited in column 7, line 46-47; also "negotiation further includes reservation of...bandwidth" recited in column 7, line 49-50); and a fifth sub-routine for adopting the mutually-agreed upon optimal allocation for the flow when the reallocation is needed (see "These parameters are then utilized..." recited in column 3, line 52-53).

Regarding claim 8, initiation means (see "interface adapter 200 of the designated DTE" recited in column 7, line 11) for initiating a communication between (see "two machines...communicate..." recited in column 7, line 40-41) the first node (see "DTE (sender)" recited in column 5, line 8) and a second node ("DCE (receiver)" recited in column 5, line 8-9) in the network (see "two machines in the LAN" recited in column 7, line 40-41) that, together, are endpoints of a link (DTE being the sender end and DCE being the receiver end), the communication being related to possible bandwidth allocation adjustment of a flow sharing the link (see "negotiation session ...to determine the best use of the available bandwidth" recited in column 7, line 44-47); determination means (the DTE itself) for determining, in the first node (see "designated DTE...determine the parameters..." recited in column 7, line 15-16), a first new bandwidth allocation (see "determine...optimized bandwidth, and optimized transfer conditions" recited in column 3, line 44-46) that approaches a first optimization condition

for the flow (see "bandwidth...optimized given the condition and quality of the line connection" recited in column 3, line 57-58); communication means (the DTE itself) for communicating with the second node (see "DTE communicates with...DCE regarding the various measurements...to determine the parameters..." recited in column 7, line 11-16) to determine a mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation for the flow (see "determine the best use of the available bandwidth..." recited in column 7, line 46-47; also "negotiation further includes reservation of...bandwidth" recited in column 7, line 49-50); and the adoption means for adopting the mutually-agreed upon optimal allocation for the flow when the reallocation is needed (see "These parameters are then utilized..." recited in column 3, line 52-53).

Galand discloses a method and system for sharing reserved bandwidth between several dependent connections in high-speed packet switching networks including the following features.

Regarding claim 1, notifying neighbor nodes in the network of the mutually agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation when reallocation is needed (see "in case of call acceptance, the modified link metrics...sent to...each node in the network by means of a broadcast algorithm).

Regarding claim 6, a third communication unit (see "origin (access) node 100" recited in column 10, line 53; which is equivalent to the DTE in Cousins) configured to notify neighbor nodes in the network of the mutually-agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation when reallocation is needed (see "in case of call acceptance, the modified link metrics...sent to...each node in the network by means of a broadcast algorithm),

wherein the third communication unit is operably connected to the first communication

unit (the origin node/DTE includes both units).

Regarding claim 7, a fourth sub-routine for notifying neighbor nodes in the

network of the mutually agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation when reallocation is

needed (see "in case of call acceptance, the modified link metrics...sent to...each node

in the network by means of a broadcast algorithm).

Regarding claim 8, notification means for notifying neighbor nodes in the network

of the mutually agreed upon optimal bandwidth allocation when reallocation is needed

(see "in case of call acceptance, the modified link metrics...sent to...each node in the

network by means of a broadcast algorithm).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the system of Kondylis by using the features, as taught by Cousins

and Galand, in order to provide efficient use of bandwidth between two nodes; and in

order to provide intermediate nodes with essential information regarding bandwidths to

be allocated to the particular link.

7.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondylis

(US 6,621,805) in view of Cousins (US 6,618,385) and Galand (US 6,628,670) as

applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Counterman (US 6,724,727).

Kondylis in view of Cousins and Galand discloses the claimed limitations

described above. Kondylis in view of Cousins and Galand do no disclose the following

features: regarding claim 3, determining, in a first node, a first new bandwidth allocation

that approaches at least one of a Max Min Fair condition and a Quality of Service

guarantee condition.

Counterman discloses a policy-based forward error correction in packet networks

including the following features.

Regarding claim 3, determining, in a first node, a first new bandwidth allocation

(explained above in the rejection made to claim 1 using Cousins) that approaches at

least one of a Max Min Fair condition and a Quality of Service guarantee condition (see

"allocates bandwidth...in order to satisfy the QoS objectives..." recited in column 1, line

63-65).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the system of Kondylis, Cousins and Galand by using the feature, as

taught by Counterman, in order to enhance the service quality to the end users.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Elliott (US 6,963,747) discloses a globally optimized channel access for wireless

networks including the steps of collecting information, calculating new schedules,

disseminating schedules to nearby nodes then switching to the new schedule.

Oishi (US 7,047,311) discloses a bandwidth management apparatus and

method, program therefor and recording medium with the program recorded thereon.

Seki (US 7,035,264) discloses a communication network system and method for synchronously controlling path connection.

Ise (US 6,999,419) discloses a communication resource management method and node control device using priority control and admission control.

Lindgren (US 6,990,120) discloses the methods for changing the bandwidth of a circuit switched channel.

Bertin (US 6,934,249) discloses the method and system for minimizing the connection set up time in high-speed packet switching networks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ju-Tai Kao whose telephone number is (571)272-9719. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday ~Friday 7:30 AM ~5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kwang Yao can be reached on (571)272-3182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ju-Tai Kao

KWANG BIN YAO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER